

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-5015

September Term, 2022

1:22-cv-03690-UNA

Filed On: May 23, 2023

Ronald Satish Emrit,
Appellant

v.

Mark Milley, Joint Chiefs of Staff,
Appellee

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE: Wilkins and Katsas, Circuit Judges, and Sentelle, Senior Circuit
Judge

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's January 4, 2023 order be affirmed. The district court properly dismissed appellant's case without prejudice for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). Appellant's complaint did not set forth "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief," which is required in order to "give the defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." Jones v. Kirchner, 835 F.3d 74, 79 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (citing Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Daniel J. Reidy
Deputy Clerk